

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on May 19, 2006 has been reviewed, as well as the art cited. Claims 2, 7, 8, 15, 20, and 21 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16-19, and 22-26 are pending in this application.

Reply to the Examiner's Response

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner responded to specific arguments presented by the Applicant. In this section, the Applicant replies to these points.

The Applicant continues to assert that the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “wherein the remapping value is logically combined with only intended address values that equal one of the bad memory address values to generate a remapped address value for only the one or more bad memory address values” as stated in independent claim 1, or “wherein the second logic combines the remapping value with only the intended address value that equals one of the bad memory address values to generate a remapped address value for only the one or more bad memory address values” as stated in independent claim 14.

However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, the Applicant has incorporated the subject matter of dependent claim 2 into independent claim 1, and the subject matter of dependent claim 15 into independent claim 14. Dependent claims 3-6, 9, 11, 16-19, 22, and 24 have been amended to provide proper indication of their respective dependencies.

Double Patenting

The Applicant acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for indicating that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-19, and 22-26 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting (as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,836 B2) has been withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 10, 13, 14, 23, and 26 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Douceur (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,893). This rejection is now moot in view of the incorporation of the limitation of claim 2 into claim 1, and the limitation of claim 15 into claim 14. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douceur ('893) as applied to claims 1 and 14 and further in view of Mano et al. ("Mano"), Logic and Computer Design. This rejection is now moot in view of the amendment made to independent claim 1 (from which claim 12 depends) and the amendment made to independent claim 14 (from which claim 25 depends). The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6, 9, 11, 15-19, 22, and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As stated above, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, the Applicant has incorporated the subject matter of dependent claim 2 into independent claim 1, and the subject matter of dependent claim 15 into independent claim 14. Dependent claims 3-6, 9, 11, 16-19, 22, and 24 have been amended to provide proper indication of their respective dependencies. As a result, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Serial No.: 10/716,984

Filing Date: 11/18/2003

Attorney Docket No. H25334-01-5833

Title: SIMPLE FAULT TOLERANCE FOR MEMORY


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16-19, and 22-26 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 455-1680.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2006



David N. Fogg
Reg. No. 35,138

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731